

**Architectural and Site Control Commission** **May 29, 2013**  
**Special Site Meeting,\* 25 Larguita Lane, Shostak, and**  
**Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

Chair Breen called the special site meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. at 25 Larguita Lane.

*(\*Note: This meeting was noticed as a joint session of the ASCC and planning commission. Since, however, only two planning commissioners were in attendance there was not a commission quorum and, therefore, a formal planning commission meeting could not be convened.)*

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch  
ASCC absent: Ross  
Planning Commission: Gilbert, McIntosh (see above note)  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Assistant Planner Borck

Others\*\* present relative to the proposal for 25 Larguita Lane:

Robert and Nancy Shostak, applicants  
Peter Duxbury and Bill McIntosh, project architects  
Tom Klope, Peter Murray and Miranda Hudson, project landscape architects  
Rusty Day, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)  
Bev Lipman, WASC  
Jane Bourne, conservation committee  
Loverine Taylor, 35 Naranja Way  
Ray Baumbach, 118 Mapache Drive  
-----

\*\*Others may have been present during the course of the site meeting but did not formally identify themselves for the record.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached Garage/Guest House Accessory Structure and horse-keeping facilities, and Site Development Permit X9H-652, 25 Larguita Lane, Shostak**

Vlasic presented the May 29, 2013 staff report on this preliminary review of a proposal for residential redevelopment of the subject 2.5-acre Westridge subdivision property. He advised that following the preliminary review and offering of comments, project consideration should be continued to the regular June 10<sup>th</sup> ASCC meeting and that, tentatively, the planning commission public hearing on the site development permit would take place at the regular June 19<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting.

Vlasic noted that he would discuss the grading plans and then turn over the presentation to the project design team. He advised that a number of comments in the staff report were on the grading plans and, particularly, the proposed fill along the southern parcel boundary. He explained that this fill and associated planting were intended to enhance screening and that the town had received a May 27<sup>th</sup> email from the neighbor, Recia Blumenkranz, supporting the grading and planting as proposed and expressing concerns over any changes to the plans.

Vlasic noted that the following plans and materials were before the ASCC and planning commission for consideration:

Sheet G-001, Cover Sheet, Cover Sheet, Duxbury Architects, 3/21/13  
Sheet G-002, Perspectives, Duxbury Architects, 12/14/12  
Sheet G-003, (Elevations), Duxbury Architects, 3/21/13

Civil Plans, Lea and Braze Engineering, Inc., 3/4/13:

Sheet C-1, Title Sheet  
Sheet C-2, Grading & Drainage Plan (with septic data)  
Sheet C-3, Grading & Drainage Plan  
Sheet C-4, Grading Specifications  
Sheet C-5, Details  
Sheet C-6, Details  
Sheet C-7, Details  
Sheet ER-1, Erosion Control Plan  
Sheet ER-2, Erosion Control Details  
Sheet SU1, Topographic Survey, 12/4/12

Page, PERK, Septic System Plan, S.R. Hartsell, REHS, 11/5/12

Landscape Plans, Thomas Klope Associates, Inc., Landscape Architects, 3/20/13:

Sheet L.1, Site Plan  
Sheet L.2, Fence, Gate and Arbor Details  
Sheet L.3, Impervious Surface Plan  
Sheet L.4, Exterior Lighting Plan  
Sheet L.5, Conceptual Planting Plan  
Sheet L.6, Tree Status Plan  
Sheet L.7, Tree Survey Index

Architectural Plans, Duxbury Architects, 3/21/13:

Sheet X-101, Floor Area Calculations  
Sheet X-102, Construction Grading & Operations Plan  
Sheet AS-101, Site Plan  
Sheet AS-501, Generator, Barn and Workshop Access  
Sheet A-101, First Floor Plan (with exterior lighting)  
    Sheet A-102, Basement Floor Plan  
Sheet A-103, Second Floor Plan  
Sheet A-104, Roof Plan  
Sheet A-201, Exterior Elevations  
Sheet A-301, Building Sections

Application supporting materials:

- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures, received March 25, 2013.
- Colors and materials board, Duxbury Associates, 3/21/13.
- Arborist's report, Urban Tree Management, Inc., 2/8/13.
- Outdoor Water Use Efficiency Checklist, 3/21/13.
- Build It Green (BIG) Single Family Checklists, received March 25, 2013.

Vlasic pointed out that story poles had been set to identify the proposed new house forms and also for the proposed guest unit to be attached to the modified garage. He also referenced the April 9, 2013 letter from the WASC, issuing a conditional approval for the project.

Vlasic presented an annotated copy of the proposed grading plan with data highlighted relative to the proposed cut and fill areas. He also referenced Figure 1 from the Romig Engineers May 2013 report on site conditions and noted where cut and fill for original site

development had taken place. It was noted that much of the area now proposed for fill placement had been disturbed previously, including the existing “mound” along the southern parcel boundary. It was also noted that the proposed mound extension was not in an area identified in the Romig report as being previously disturbed. Vlasic referenced a May 23, 2013 email from Tom Porter, Romig Engineers, advising that it can be assumed that all existing on site soils, native and fill, can be used for proposed project fill.

After review of the grading plans, Tom Klope presented the proposed landscape plans and Peter Duxbury presented the proposed architectural plans, including the proposed colors and materials board. The following were noted during the presentation:

- The new house improvements will be at the elevation of the existing house. The majority of the fill is generated from the new basement and proposed access to the basement workshop. A project model was presented along with the other plan materials including actual samples the materials presented on the finish board. It was clarified that the design was a “California Hacienda” style.
- The intention is to remove as much of the non native plantings with the project as possible, but some removal, now important for screening between properties, e.g., the south side plantings, would be phased. Also, the intent is to remove all pines at the end of the project, even though this is not specifically shown on the grading plans.
- The south side screen planting is for privacy and particularly to control the penetration of light from cars entering the neighboring property at night.
- The fill is largely directed at the areas that were previously disturbed, except for the mound area and new driveway proposed to access the lower workshop. This driveway would have a base to accommodate periodic access, by a soil cover that is planted in grasses to minimize the visual presence for a facility that will have very limited use.
- The only domestic planting would be very close to the house and the only new fencing is very limited as shown on the plans. The fencing is for the pasture area and small sections at the house pad, as well as the new driveway gate that matches the low, pasture fencing. The intention is to allow deer and other wildlife “full” access to the site and no fencing to restrict wildlife movement is proposed.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the small oaks planted recently along the east side of the driveway would be relocated with the project. It was also clarified that an 11-inch oak located on the west side of the existing rear yard mound would be preserved. It was noted that the grading plans show this tree to be removed.
- In response to a question, it was noted that at least four sets of neighbors had seen the project plans.
- In response to “soils” comments in the report from the conservation committee, Klope noted that much of the site had been disturbed by original grading and the extent of fill identified in the Romig report. He also noted the extent of area used for pasture. He clarified that soils and grasses were not “pristine” and that he is confident that the plan proposed can be implemented.

After plan presentation, the applicants and design team members led all present on a walk of the site to inspect existing conditions and consider project proposals, particularly the planned grading. The inspection included the rear yard area where the existing guest house and pool are to be removed, the west side slopes and the area along the southern boundary. Also considered were the pasture area and the area for the proposed septic system drainfield.

During the course of the site inspection the following matters were considered and comments offered:

- Driveway grading and planting on the Blumenkranz property were considered, as was the existing planting along the southern boundary of the subject property.
- Several ASCC members noted that the scope of boundary line planting appeared to be linear and could create a “hedge-like” condition, contrary to town landscape guidelines.
- The non native materials along the southern boundary should be removed sooner than later. It was noted that there are a number of oaks in the area that could flourish with removal of the other materials.
- There is considerable planting on the Blumenkranz parcel that is relatively dense and will in a short time provide significant screening. Further, removal of the non native materials and redwoods along the southern boundary on the subject site would open views to the western hillsides.
- The driveway paver samples appear very dark and it was suggested that a lighter mix of colors be considered to blend better with the adjacent grasslands.
- Consideration needs to be given to better blending of the proposed south side fill contours to avoid the appearance of a long, linear mound. Further, it was noted that with the current plan there would be a low, narrow “valley” like condition between the mound and elevated driveway grade on the Blumenkranz property, resulting in a very unusual and “un-natural” appearance to the slope.
- Consideration might also be given to placing more fill on the west side slopes as it appears this area can accommodate added fill depth.
- Clark suggested consideration of some additional tree plantings on the north side of the pasture area.

Neighbor comments were requested, and none were offered. In response to a question, Day advised that the WASC was supportive of the project as proposed subject to the conditions contained in the April 9, 2013 approval letter.

Planning Commissioner **McIntosh** stated he had no specific comments to offer beyond the issues discussed during the course of the site walk. Commissioner **Gilbert** advised she was concerned with the scope of proposed fill, particularly the artificial landform that would result from the proposed mound. She also shared the conservation committee concerns over the soils conditions and ability of disturbed surfaces to accommodate growth of native grasses.

ASCC members concurred that they would offer specific comments at the regular evening ASCC meeting.

After the site inspection and consideration of plans and the clarifications offered, ASCC members and planning commissioners present thanked the applicants and others for their participation in the site meeting. Thereafter, ASCC project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The special site meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

**Architectural and Site Control Commission**  
**Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California**

**May 29, 2013**

Chair Breen called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

**Roll Call:**

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Hughes, Koch  
Absent: Ross  
Planning Commission Liaison: None  
Town Council Liaison: None  
Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Assistant Planner Borck  
Karen Kristiansson, Principal Planner

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

**Continuing Review, Architectural Review and Site Development Permit X9H-653 for Residential Redevelopment, 308 Canyon Drive, Lenderking**

Vlastic presented the May 29, 2013 staff report on this continuing project review. He discussed the May 13, 2013 preliminary project review and how the revised plans and materials, listed below, respond to the preliminary review input. ASCC members then reviewed the staff report and the following revised plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated May 20, 2013 and prepared by Webfoot Construction:

Page A-1, Intro., As Built Floor Plan  
Page A-2, New Floor Plan  
Page A-3, Elevations  
Page A-4, Landscape Plan, Story Pole Plan  
Page A-5, Reflected Ceiling Plan  
Page A-5, Roof Plan  
Sheet 1, Grading Plan, Triad/Holmes Assoc., 5/15/13  
Sheet 2, Erosion Control Plan, Triad/Holmes Assoc., 5/15/13  
Light fixture cut sheets received May 17, 2013.

Vlastic advised that still part of the application before the ASCC are the following materials:

- Exterior materials board dated 3/27/13. Vlastic noted that this board was found acceptable at the 5/13 meeting subject to modification of the proposed trim color for consistency with town light reflectivity value limits.
- Outdoor water use efficiency checklist, 3/28/13.
- Cut sheets for proposed house mounted wall and recessed light fixtures.
- GreenPoint Rated Checklist, received March 28, 2013.

Applicants Mike Solosky and Paul Lenderking presented the revised plans to the ASCC. They offered additional project clarifications as follows:

- The "upper" driveway connection to Canyon Drive will be kept during the construction process and used for construction access. Thus, the loop driveway will be maintained during construction so that vehicles can arrive heading in on the upper connection and exit at the lower connection. The driveway widening with culvert improvements would be made for the lower, permanent access as shown on the revised plans. Similar

temporary improvements would be made for the upper access and removed at the end of construction when this connection to Canyon Drive is eliminated. However, if the public works director wants the upper culvert work to remain, this would be accomplished.

- The southwest side outdoor area is not planned for construction use. This is to avoid any potential for damage to the area. At this point the plan is to seed the area with native grasses. (*Breen suggested use of a no-mow sod, likely Delta Blue Grass. The applicants advised they were not aware of such an alternative to native seed and would look into this sod alternative. Clark advised that the applicants should remain open to using this south side area for some construction staging and storage.*)
- In response to a question from Clark, the applicants advised that they had considered a gable feature for the long roof form facing Canyon Drive, but rejected it because it did not work with the desired simple contemporary look for the front elevation. Instead, the front elevation deck with contemporary railing was used to soften and add visual variety to the front elevation.
- In response to a concern regarding too much use of evergreen trees for uphill screening, the applicants advised that they would consider use of deciduous trees and would be pleased to work with the uphill neighbors relative to screen tree selection and placement.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

After brief discussion, Hughes moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the revised plans as discussed and clarified at the meeting subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of a designated ASCC member prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. All site development committee review requirements as set forth in the May 13, 2013 staff report and attachments to it and those set forth in the 5/23/13 report from the public works shall be complied with to the satisfaction of the respective site development committee member.
2. A detailed landscape plan shall be provided specifying trees and shrubs by type and size and these shall be responsive to the ASCC comments on plant selection offered at the May 29, 2013 ASCC meeting. Further, the plan shall provide for field placement of key screen trees under the direction of a designated ASCC member and for planting of these trees early in the construction process, i.e., as soon after demolition and completion of rough grading as possible.
3. A detailed construction staging plan shall be provided with the building permit submittal to address all of the concerns noted in the preliminary review comments and the access clarifications provided at the ASCC meeting. This plan shall be to the satisfaction of planning staff, the designated ASCC member and the public works director.
4. The proposed exterior materials board shall be modified to identify a darker trim color that is consistent with town light reflectivity value limits.

**Preliminary Architectural Review for new residence with detached Garage/Guest House Accessory Structure and horse-keeping facilities, and Site Development Permit X9H-652, 25 Larguita Lane, Shostak**

Vlasic presented the May 29, 2013 staff report on this preliminary project review. He discussed the events and comments associated with the afternoon site meeting on the proposals. (Refer to above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of project plans and materials and the correspondence related to the project received to date.) Vlasic clarified that at the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members agreed to offer specific preliminary comments at the evening meeting prior to continuing project review to the regular June 10, 2013 ASCC meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Shostak, Peter Duxbury and Bill McIntosh, project architects, and Tom Klope, project landscape architect, were present to discuss their plans further with the ASCC. They offered the following comments in response to input received at the site meeting:

- The grading plan will be revised to “flatten” the more mound-like forms shown on the current grading plans. Given site conditions, tree cover, etc., there is concern over adding more fill on the western slopes of the site. Nonetheless, considerable effort took place after the site meeting to develop grading plan revisions to address the grading plan concerns with the objective of making the final contours as natural looking as possible.
- A “lighter mix” of proposed driveway paver material will be identified and presented for ASCC consideration at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- In response to a question, it was noted that some fill might be considered for the pasture area, but this would be tempered by septic system requirements.
- In response to a question, it was clarified that no lighting is proposed for the detached rear yard arbor feature or for the new barn. It was noted that the current barn has been used “for years” without the need for lighting or electricity.

Public comments were requested. **Rusty Day, WASC**, offered the following observations:

- The applicants have provided the proper example of how to interact with neighbors. Further, they have fully responded to neighbor and WASC comments and concerns with effective plan revisions.
- Since the first submittal to the WASC they have reduced the height and scale of the house design to fit into the site and also modified the landscape plan to remove the pine trees. Further, they have significantly scaled back the extent of proposed exterior lighting.
- The WASC strongly supports the plans as now presented and as reflected in the April 9, 2013 WASC approval letter.

No other public comments were offered.

ASCC members then discussed the proposal and offered the following preliminary comments:

- Members concurred that the overall site plan and proposed architectural solutions were appropriate, as were the proposed building materials and finishes. A qualification was offered relative to the proposed tile roofing and a mix of colors with lighter shades was recommended.
- The grading issues discussed at the site meeting need to be resolved. It was generally agreed that the solution should not be a linear berm form. Further, members supported more removal of the south side exotic plants sooner rather than later. For example, the redwood trees should be removed before they become a visual issue and the junipers should also be removed.

- The landscape plan needs to be reconsidered to reduce the scope of proposed boundary line planting.
- All exterior lighting should be shown on one plan sheet. Further, consideration should be given to removing some of the rear yard path lights and perhaps lights on the garage building.
- Clark suggested consideration be given to moving the driveway section that parallels the south boundary to the north to allow more room for flattening out the grade between the property line and driveway. This was tempered, however, given driveway grade and curve requirements and also septic drainfield requirements.
- Koch commented that while the need for privacy between parcels is understood, removal of the old, exotic materials and mound would actually open views from the subject site to the western hillsides and this is one of the most significant and attractive views that helps to define the character of the town. She encouraged finding a balance between the privacy matter and view preservation.
- Clark commented that while there is not a significant issue with thistle on the property, the instances that do exist should be addressed now. He also commented that some additional tree planting should be considered now for the pasture area in anticipation of the eventual demise of the pines.
- Breen emphasized that while she would like to see the existing berm removed, she appreciates that likely can't happen. She encouraged removal of all exotic materials and allowing the existing oaks to grow. She also stressed that the plant materials on the Blumenkranz parcel would create a hedge condition in 3-4 years and that added massing on the subject site was not necessary. She encouraged an approach that celebrated experiencing the land rather than boxing in a site just to achieve some privacy.

Following sharing of the above comments, project review was continued to the June 10, 2013 regular ASCC meeting.

---

*Prior to consideration of the following application, Clark temporarily left his ASCC position and moved to the audience. He explained that his home/property is directly across the street from the application site and that because the plans could impact him he can offer input on the proposal as a neighbor, but could not participate in ASCC discussion as an ASCC member.*

---

### **Architectural Review for Residential Additions and Remodeling, 140 Corte Madera Road, Lee**

Vlasic presented the May 29, 2013 staff report on this proposal to add 1,133 sf of living area to the existing single level, 2,464-sf residence on the subject .56-acre Brookside Park subdivision property. He explained that the proposal is for modifications to the existing main level, including living area additions and changes to the garage access, and the addition of a new, 827 sf second story over the rear, west side, of the existing house.

Vlasic also advised that the total house floor area with the proposed main level additions and new second story would concentrate 94% of the permitted floor area in the main house and that special considerations and findings need to be made by the ASCC to permit the floor area proposal. He noted that these findings are evaluated in the staff report and discussed in the attached letters from the applicants dated May 23, 2013 and from the project design team dated April 1, 2013. Vlasic added that while it appears the findings can



be made as evaluated in the staff report, this is dependent on input from neighbors that may be provided at the ASCC meeting.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following proposed project plans dated March 25, 2012 and prepared by Harrell Remodeling, Inc.:

- Sheet A0, Proposed Lower Floor and Site Plan
- Sheet A1, Existing Lower Floor Plan
- Sheet A2, Proposed Lower Floor Plan
- Sheet A3, Proposed Upper Floor Plan
- Sheet A4a, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet A4b, Exterior Elevations
- Sheet GPR1, GreenPoint Checklist

Also considered were the following application materials:

- An exterior materials board received 4/1/13. It was noted that the board includes the cut sheet for the proposed exterior light fixture.
- Outdoor water use efficiency checklist, 3/26/13.
- Arborist Report, Johnson Tree Service, received 4/1/13 for removal of one *Ganoderma asplanatum* tree, which has been removed.

It was also noted that story poles were in place at the site to model the proposed house changes and additions.

Iris Harrell, Rafael Gomez, and Beth Liebbrandt from Harrell Remodeling, Inc., presented the plans to the ASCC. In response to comments in the staff report relative to building height and need for a complete site driveway paving/access plan and complete front yard landscape plan, they presented the following plans prepared by Harrell Remodeling:

- Sheet 1, Site Plan & Notes (with proposed front yard landscaping and pavement area), 5/28/13
- Sheet 5a, Exterior Elev. (with height adjustments for height limit conformity and a window addition to the proposed north side elevation), 5/28/13
- Sheet 5b, Exterior Elev. (with height adjustments for height limit conformity and noting that the garage door finish would match that proposed for the house siding), 5/28/13
- Manufacturer's Product Sheet for the proposed Martin Flushline steel garage doors without any windows

In response to questions the design team provided the following clarifications:

- The proposed upper floor plate height is now 8.5 feet, and this is a reduction of 6 inches from the original plan to accommodate for compliance with the 28-foot height limit.
- In addition to the lights shown on the plans, there would be one new light at the garage and all existing exterior floodlights would be removed with the project.
- The 5/28 site plan reflects proposals for removal of existing asphalt paved areas.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

**Chris Boskin, 150 Corte Madera Road**, raised concern over neighbor communications and that the applicant had not informed her of the proposal. She commented that she was not aware until the story poles were in place. She discussed the history of installation of the retaining wall on the site adjacent to her property and concerns expressed to the applicant

relative to the wall. She stressed that if the project is allowed to proceed a comprehensive landscape plan should be required and this should include screening along the boundary with her property.

**Jeff Clark, 149 Corte Madera Road**, wondered if a one-story option was considered for the master bedroom addition. He also offered the following comments:

- An adequate front yard plan should be provided that provides for parking, ensures safe access to the street, and presents appropriate landscape improvements.
- The front yard fence should be required to conform to town standards.
- Given the scope of the project, the window colors should be consistent with town's policies relative to light reflectivity values (LRV). It was suggested that the few "white" windows to remain could be painted to match the new windows that are in a color that conforms to the town's policies for LRV.
- The proposed large front elevation window over the desk area of the upper level master bedroom be reduced in size to control light spill and to be more in keeping with the scale of the other upper level windows on this elevation.
- The setback from the front property line needs to be verified.

In response to the question of consideration of the master bedroom on the ground level, Harrell advised that this approach would use up much of the available ground level and also require more changes to the existing main house level.

In response to the front setback question, Vlasic advised that this would be verified at the building permit stage of the project to the satisfaction of the town's building official.

ASCC members discussed the project and all concurred that they could make findings to allow for the proposed concentration of floor area as evaluated in the staff report. Members also concurred that a significant effort was needed for landscaping for the site to support the findings and that the plans should conform to current limits for front yard fencing and house trim color.

Following discussion, Koch moved, seconded by Hughes and passed 3-0 to approve the plans as clarified, including clarifications made with the May 28, 2013 plan revisions subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to release of any building permits:

1. A comprehensive site landscape plan shall be provided that addresses not only the front yard area but also areas around the side and rear of the house. The objectives include reduction in asphalt area while still providing for adequate space for appropriate site ingress and egress, enhancing the site frontage, and selective screening between properties. Any proposal for front yard fencing shall be consistent with current town fencing standards.
2. The finish for existing and new windows shall be consistent with town policies relative to LRV.
3. A complete house and yard lighting plan shall be presented and all lighting plans shall be on one plan sheet.
4. A comprehensive construction-staging plan shall be provided and implemented to the satisfaction of town planning staff.

In response to a question from Harrell, Vlastic commented that building permit plans for the house modifications could be processed through the town's plan check procedures while the conditions are being addressed with the ASCC.

---

*Following the above action, Clark returned to his ASCC position.*

---

### **Review of Draft Portola Road Corridor Plan.**

Kristiansson presented the May 29, 2013 staff report. She mentioned that the draft Plan uses the format from most of the other elements of the general plan, and the content is primarily from the work of the Portola Road Taskforce. She clarified that some additional content came from comments from the planning commission and also from statements about the corridor that are already contained in the general plan, especially in the land use element. She advised that the draft is being circulated to members of the Portola Road Taskforce, including ASCC Chair Breen, and their committees and that comments from this circulation will be provided to the planning commission in June. It was explained that when the commission is satisfied with the draft, it would be presented to the town council at a study session and, once there is a final draft, staff would begin the work to set this for formal hearing and action.

Vlastic added that much of the recent work on the draft plan has been to craft the description section so that it would provide guidance for each segment of the corridor.

Breen mentioned that she was glad to see that the draft element includes some more poetic language relative to the importance of the corridor. In addition, she appreciated the emphasis on keeping the views open, especially in light of the recent project at the Priory and the conflict with the idea of adding screening along the Portola Road frontage. Kristiansson mentioned that the draft plan focused more on opening the views to the western hillsides and more important views, and Vlastic stated that the desire for screening came really from a couple of commissioners and the intent has never been to screen all man-made elements. Clark added that the town would want to avoid a tunnel effect and Breen said that the openness is not just for key views but also to provide an experience of the land.

Clark stated that he had a few very specific comments. First, the guard rail at the bend of the Sequoias is very linear and white, which does not seem consistent with the corridor plan. Second, perhaps the town should remove the eucalyptus trees at the front of the Spring Down property to set an example of opening the corridor. Breen mentioned that this has been proposed, and the Trails Committee is reviewing the concept. Third, controlling the parking on Portola Road near Windy Hill continues to be a challenge. Kristiansson stated that the Public Works Director is working on this issue, and he is starting with softer and less obtrusive approaches to see if they work.

More specifically in terms of the draft plan, Clark said that he thought that #4 in the Standards section should specify that both native and non-native vegetation could be removed, and this is not limited to only exotics. For #5 in that section, he believes that it is a good idea but wondered how it can be done and what the teeth are. Vlastic said that this would be enforced when an application is submitted. Regarding Section 6413, Clark suggested that the open space district should coordinate with Neely on managing the meadow if Neely moves forward with a meadow improvement plan. Breen added that she

hopes that if Neely is going to hay his portion of the meadow, she would hope that the district would arrange for him to hay their side at the same time.

### **Commission and Staff Reports**

Breen reported on the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting to address issues with unauthorized planting along the Portola Road frontage of the Stone house property at 451 Portola Road. She noted that the property owner has agreed to remove several plants and that it was agreed some could remain. She also noted that the town was waiting for a more complete and comprehensive landscape plan for the project conditionally approved for 230 Shawnee Pass.

Clark reported that he appreciates the letter received from Mr. and Mrs. Patterson, Stonegate Road, relative to the Neely Meadow. He commented, however, that he supports the Neely plans for added agricultural uses, but with the provisions that there is a clear plan for meadow management and that this should also be a requirement of the MROSD for its portion of the meadow area.

Clark also reported on some construction concerns he had been made aware of at 154 Wayside Road, near planning commissioner Nate McKitterick's property.

Breen reports on the proliferation of construction site signs, i.e., contractors, architects, landscapers, etc. and the length of time they stay on a property. It was agreed that this should at least be reviewed as part of the on-going zoning ordinance update work, but that there may also be the need for added enforcement of current ordinance provisions relative to such temporary construction signs.

Vlasic reviewed the upcoming ASCC meeting schedule and noted that some meetings may be cancelled due to vacation schedules and planning staff transitions around the July 1<sup>st</sup>, i.e., the start of the new fiscal year.

### **Minutes**

Hughes moved, seconded by Clark, and passed 3-0-1 (Breen) approval of the May 13, 2013 meeting minutes as drafted relative to the Neely application and 4-0 for the remainder of the May 13<sup>th</sup> minutes with the following correction, change "understating" to "understanding" in the first line of the last paragraph on page 11.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

T. Vlasic